



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

am seeking to regain. The true patriot is not he who when unjustly exiled abstains from attacking his country, but he who in the warmth of his affection for her seeks to regain her without regard to means". The case of Polynices against Thebes is made by Euripides a strong and sympathetic parallel for this.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY

VASSAR COLLEGE

### PROFESSOR ASHMORE'S REPLY<sup>1</sup>

In reference to what Professor Fairclough has said about my edition of the Comedies of Terence, I would ask the readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY to suspend judgment until they have taken into account the following considerations:

Professor Fairclough directs the larger part of his attack against Tyrrell's text, which I have adopted (see my preface), and for which accordingly I am sponsor. In corroboration of his denunciation of that text he cites what he calls a "searching review" of it by Paul Wessner, which appeared some time ago in the Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift (Volume 23). Mr. Fairclough takes it for granted that all the world must accept Wessner's verdict, whereas most of the world has learned, in the last quarter of a century, that German scholarship is not infallible, and that in dealing with anything of British origin it is almost invariably prejudiced.

In seeking to prove the "searching" character of Wessner's review Mr. Fairclough cites three verses in which an unnecessary ictus is printed. The ictus was printed once on certain words in these verses, in accordance with the theory then held of their scansion; later, transpositions were made, and yet, though the words involved no longer carried an ictus, the ictus, by bad proof-reading, was allowed to stand. Here, surely, we have no question of text-criticism or of scholarship, but mere typographical blunders, reprehensible, yes, but no proof of the inferiority of the text in which they occur or of the unsoundness of the critical principles of the editor, whose eyes were not keen enough to detect and remove them.

In reference to Tyrrell's alleged "weakness" for *equidem*, the reader is referred to the last page of Tyrrell's preface, where Tyrrell justifies his "weakness" on the ground that the form *equidem* (as opposed to *quidem*) is really the true form of the word, which he (Tyrrell) has restored, and on the further ground that the copyists were not aware that it could be used with the second and third persons. That it was so used by Plautus, Sallust and other ancients, we have only to consult Harper's Latin Lexicon for proof; see also Reisig-Haase Vorlesungen, I. 392. On the same page of his preface Tyrrell refers to the admission into his text

of such forms as *ist*, *rest* and *reapse*, and implies that they are admitted for the meter's sake. At any rate, there is plenty of analogy for *ist* and *rest*, while *reapse* is easily accounted for. "Yet our editor makes no comment", says Mr. Fairclough. But I explain that *ist* = *is est*, and that *rest* = *res est* (see notes on Andr. 906 and 459), and that *reapse* is equivalent to *re* + *eapse* (old form = *ipsa*): see note on Hec. 778.

Mr. Fairclough would lead the reader to suppose that, because I sometimes express dissent from Tyrrell's readings (a thing which I hold to be quite proper; never before have I seen it implied that independence of judgment is reprehensible), there is "not seldom inconsistency between text and commentary" in my book. I can only say in reply to this, that nowhere in the book is there any "inconsistency between text and commentary". The commentary everywhere relates to the text as the latter stands in the book, and not to any other text; the lemma of my notes is always a word or words actually seen in my text. Mr. Fairclough is confused; I do frequently, so he says, express a preference for readings other than Tyrrell's; but, I repeat, lemmata and text agree always. Even on Andr. 536, where Mr. Fairclough tries hard to make it appear that my note deals with *pauca* only, while my text reads *paucis*, my note actually discusses *paucis* (of the text) before it mentions *pauca*, and though the note may seem to defend *pauca*, yet the note's logical application to the text is clear. Nor does Mr. Fairclough give the exact truth in saying that at Andr. 288 I leave a footnote (of Tyrrell's) "which is now (i. e. after my modification of Tyrrell's scansion) inconsistent with the text"; for I have made an addition (in brackets) to the footnote, which addition rectifies any possible inconsistency, and, what is more, I have explained the whole difficulty in the commentary—all of which Mr. Fairclough ignores.

Mr. Fairclough takes me to task for omitting to alter Tyrrell's footnote on Ph. 370—a footnote which, as he expresses it, "must make most scholars either blush or smile". But Tyrrell's footnote is merely an independent expression of preference for a certain scansion which Tyrrell himself does not adopt. Therefore it does not affect the text and does not need to be expunged. Moreover, so good a scholar as A. Palmer did not "blush" to sanction a like scansion in Plaut. Am. 3. 2. 50 (930), and he had the German scholar Spengel as his authority.

Again it may be, that to some minds the omission from the Introduction of a conspectus metrorum and of a summary of Terentian linguistic peculiarities is as serious a matter as Mr. Fairclough would have it appear. To my mind, however, the consequent gain in space is full justification for the omission complained of. But Mr. Fairclough misrepresents

<sup>1</sup> For Professor Fairclough's review of Professor Ashmore's Terence, see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 2. 140-143.

sents me when he assumes (and it is pure assumption) that I refer the student to the 'Einleitung' prefixed to the Dziatzko-Hauler edition of the *Phormio* as though this were an adequate substitute for the summary in question. My words, which follow those quoted by Professor Fairclough (see my preface, p. vii), namely, "but the student will do well to consult the admirable 'Einleitung', etc.", prove that I do not regard it as adequate. Moreover, I do not believe that with such a summary given in the Introduction I could have "dispensed with many notes and unnecessary repetitions". Summary or no summary, it is a fact that constant reference to the sections of an introduction can never take the place of explanatory notes presented in their own proper place, and it is also a fact that frequent repetitions in the commentary of a book like the one before us are not only desirable but exceedingly important. Such repetitions are all too few in the present volume, while those that do appear are due to a desire to make the book easily and immediately useful, whatever the play by which the student is introduced to Terence.

Mr. Fairclough has an interesting way (already apparent) of holding back a part of my statement, when to quote the whole of it would tell against the point he is making against me. For example, he finds that my acceptance of the year 190 (this year is now more commonly believed to be the right one than the year 185; see footnote, Introduction, p. 26) as the birth-year of Terence does not tally with my subsequent statement (Introduction, p. 29) that "the poet's stylistic qualities appear to be most miraculous in view of his immature years and foreign extraction", but in quoting me Mr. Fairclough omits the words "and foreign extraction". These words are exceedingly important to my point, though, of course, they are exceedingly detrimental to his. But even if the year 190 be accepted as that of Terence's birth, Terence would have been only thirty-one years old when he died (and only twenty-five years old when he wrote the *Andria*). It is certainly not inappropriate to speak of the immature years of a literary man of thirty-one (not to mention twenty-five), particularly when we remember how late in life Roman men matured (consider the well-known story of Caesar and Alexander in Suetonius, Jul. 7).

How Mr. Fairclough can say that I make no reference to so important an authority as Klotz (*Grundzüge Altrömische Metrik*) I do not see. Possibly he refers only to my Introduction. If so I am in good company, for Mr. Fairclough himself omits all reference to that authority from his own Introduction to the *Andria*. True, he refers to Klotz in his Appendix, but I also do the same in mine; see my Appendix on Ph. 901.

Again, the difference in the scansion between the specimen of Saturnian verse on p. 12 of my In-

troduction and the epitaph of Naevius on p. 17 of the same is fully accounted for by references in footnotes on both of those pages, one of the references being to Mr. Fairclough's own edition of the *Andria*, p. xxv, n. 2. Yet he complains that "no explanation (of the difference) is given" in my book.

Mr. Fairclough says that I accept certain scansion "which are now generally discarded". His list is given in his article. One of them is *dicerē* (Andr. 23), the only one selected from the *Andria*. Yet this one Mr. Fairclough himself accepts in his edition of the *Andria* and makes no comment, although Fleckeisen inserts *ut* into his text, evidently in order to get rid of the final long *e*. But as a matter of fact these scansion have not been "generally discarded". The editors of the *Classical Review* did not hesitate to print Professor Hodgman's papers on noun-declension in Plautus and adjectival forms in Plautus (*Class. Rev.* for 1902, July and December), in which Professor Hodgman records repeated instances of these very scansion. In these days, when the quantitative theory of Saturnian verse is again warmly advocated (see Leo, *Der Saturnische Vers*, as reviewed by Professor Abbott in *Classical Philology*, 2. No. 4), and when Skutsch's "brilliant demonstration" (Lindsay) that final *e* was often disregarded in Plautine scansion is being vigorously challenged by so keen a student of Plautine meters as Professor Radford, it behooves all critics to pause and consider before they count too many things as certainties. As to Mr. Fairclough's method of dealing with my statement regarding the elision of certain final consonants, I refer the reader to Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, 225 ff.

In the remarks on the Terentian codices given in his next paragraph Mr. Fairclough harps upon my alleged disloyalty to γ, occasioned by my adherence to Tyrrell (who gives the preference to the δ group of Mss.). But the differences between γ and δ cited by Fairclough (all from the *Andria*!!) are so trivial that I should hardly have been justified in taking note of them, even if I had been as willing to slight Tyrrell's readings as Professor Fairclough professes to be. My critical note on Andr. 849 gives the best of reasons why I am "ready to reject a good (?) reading given by all Mss.". Is a consensus of the Mss. never to be gainsaid? Professor Fairclough knows better.

Of course "Weissner" (p. 66) is a misprint for Wessner, and our critic has made the most of it. But the name has not been misspelled where it occurs elsewhere in the book, and the error here was long ago corrected in the plates. But I am indebted to Professor Fairclough for calling my attention to the following misprint (p. 64), which might be misleading: the phrase, "the fifteenth century", has been printed in two successive lines. In the second line where it applies to Eugraphius the word "fifth"

(or "sixth") should take the place of the word "fifteenth"; see my article on Terence in Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities. *Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*, as the typographical errors occurring in Professor Fairclough's recent edition of Vergil, and alluded to (with deference) by Professor Carroll in his review of that book, clearly show: see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 2. 69. Moreover, I think I have shown that Professor Fairclough has "nodded" also in the course of his review of my book—a far less lengthy and sleep-compelling task than that of the proof-readers of Ashmore's Terence.

But the space allowed me for this reply is limited. Professor Fairclough has discovered now that I am unkind to Eugraphius as well as to Wagner and Parry, and again cautions me against throwing stones. He is determined to have me lacking in due appreciation of the Roman grammarians, yet in quoting me to this end he should not have held back a part of what I say. But then that is his way, as I have already pointed out.

It is a little odd, if not also significant, that, whether Professor Fairclough is talking about my text or my commentary, he seems to find it hard to get away from the Andria. In consequence the larger part of my book is still without the benefit of his "searching" criticism. At Andria, 213-214, his criticism is based on his own note (see his edition of that play). But he is careful not to call attention to what my note offers to the student in lieu of that which is contained in his. Again at Andr. 304 I think I have established my point in reference to *cura confectus*. I think also that Mr. Fairclough's quotations from Ennius and Cicero tend to confirm what I have said rather than what he says. On Andr. 305 the derivation I give of *cdepol* is regarded as *probable* by Walde, Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (1905), a book highly rated by competent critics. In my note on Andr. 328 I give my reasons for preferring *haec* to *hae*. Terence had already become one of the *veteres* when Cicero wrote. On Andr. 439 Mr. Fairclough quotes only a part of my note and then says that it "will hardly hold", whereas in that very note I refer the student to his edition of the Andria, in which the "well-known rule" as to the use of *huiusce* is given in full. Any student, therefore, who is of opinion that such rules have no exceptions may easily fall back on Mr. Fairclough's teachings and discard mine. In Andr. 483 the "interesting reading *istam*" hangs on a slender thread—so much so that to discuss it, except in a special edition of the Andria, seems hardly worth while. Wessner is not convinced that Donatus "knew it", nor does the word occur in the Bembine Scholia, but only something like it. Moreover, Mr. Fairclough, in bringing it into his text (instead of *ista*) against the testimony of the γ

Mss., does violence to that very allegiance which he would force others to respect.

The space allowed me is not sufficient for a full discussion of Mr. Fairclough's remarks, nor, indeed, for more than a very meager response to his criticisms. I am not of the opinion that my book is faultless, but I do think that Professor Fairclough has failed to show either that the text is "faulty" in any real or technical sense of the word, or that the book contains "numerous errors in details", or that there is any necessity to use my edition "with caution". *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*, says Tacitus, very truly, and his words have a peculiar significance, as applied to the dubious phraseology employed by Professor Fairclough in the present "review"; for that gentleman has gone out of his way to misquote me, to give a false color to my statements, and generally to mislead the uninitiated. His remarks reflect a determined effort toward a microscopic search for pin-head faults and a manifest avoidance of all search for anything good in the book. Were it not for the animus thus displayed, his "review" would be welcomed by the editor, as every review should be that is intended to bring into relief such errors as are genuine, and of veritable importance to the student.

Schenectady, New York

S. G. ASHMORE

#### THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The twenty-sixth luncheon of the New York Latin Club took place at the Hotel Marlborough on Saturday, February 27. After the luncheon the guest of the Club, Professor John C. Kirtland, of Phillips Exeter Academy, set forth some of the observations he had made in a recent trip of examination to the English schools. The paper will be published in a subsequent issue of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, but it is important to remark here that Professor Kirtland showed clearly the great elasticity of the English system of Latin instruction as compared with our inelastic Caesar, Cicero and Vergil curriculum. This is an important difference and may go far to explain the machine-like kind of instruction that deadens so much of our Latin teaching.

The President reported that the committee on the subject of Greek, appointed last spring, had had a conference with Dr. Stevens, Associate Superintendent of Schools for New York City, and had been assured of the cordial good-will of the educational administration to Greek and their willingness to support it to the limit of their resources, but did not get much satisfaction in definite promises.

The Treasurer reported that the scholarship fund was completed, having reached nearly \$5,200, that this was invested in such a way that an income of \$250 a year was assured. The Club, therefore, voted that the executive committee be directed to frame